

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11  
12 DAWN C. WIGGINS,  
13

14 Plaintiff(s),

15 v.

No. C 12-05430 WHA

16 BARBARA HOUSELY, et al.,

(AP 11-1153)

17 Defendant(s).  
18 \_\_\_\_\_/

19 BANKRUPTCY JUDGE'S REPORT TO THE DISTRICT COURT  
20 \_\_\_\_\_

21 On September 19, 2012, the court held a trial in the above adversary proceeding as to the three  
22 remaining defendants, Barbara Housley, Roman Meacham, and DPPM, Inc, doing business as Zephyr  
23 Real Estate ("Zephyr"). The court issued its written Memorandum on September 21, 2012.

24 The action against Housely and Meacham was a core action based on § 110 of the Bankruptcy  
25 Code. The court accordingly entered a separate judgment against them on October 2, 2012. However,  
26 the liability the court found on the part of Zephyr was based only on state law for negligently failing to

1 supervise Housley, and Zephyr did not consent to entry of a final judgment by the bankruptcy court.  
2 Accordingly, the court directed that as to Zephyr its Memorandum of September 21 be considered  
3 proposed findings and conclusions.

4 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(c)(1), when a bankruptcy court is not empowered to enter a final  
5 judgment is must transmit its proposed findings and conclusions to the district court for entry of a  
6 judgment after consideration of the findings and conclusions and do novo review of those matters to  
7 which any party has timely and specifically objected. This is a rare occurrence, this court having made  
8 such transmittal only one other time in 27 years.

9 Pursuant to § 157(c)(1), the court directed the Clerk to transmit the court's Memorandum of  
10 September 21, 2012, which constituted the court's proposed findings and conclusions. The Clerk  
11 made such a transmission but the district court misconstrued it as a defective appeal and dismissed the  
12 proceeding on November 13, 2012.

13 The undersigned apologizes for not having made its transmission clearer, and respectfully  
14 requests that the district court vacate its order of November 13, 2012, and proceed to review this  
15 court's proposed findings and conclusions pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(c)(1).

16  
17 Dated: December 8, 2012

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26



Alan Jaroslovsky  
U.S. Bankruptcy Judge